REMARKS

In response to the Office Action mailed August 14, 2007, the Applicant submits this Reply. In view of the following remarks, reconsideration is requested.

Claims 1-6 remain in this application, of which claims 1 and 4 are independent. No fee is due for claims for this amendment.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-6, of which claims 1 and 4 are independent, were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 over U.S. Patent No. 6,654,028 ("Yamakawa") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,081,523 ("Frazier"). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

As noted in the Office Action and in Applicant's prior replies, Yamakawa does not teach "determining a scaling factor according to a ratio of the input luminance to the output luminance." See Office Action, page 3, last 13-14 lines. More precisely, however, Yamakawa does not teach "scaling the output saturation [for a pixel] by the scaling factor" where the scaling factor is determined "according to a ratio of the input luminance [for the pixel] to the output luminance [determined for the pixel]" as claimed in independent claims 1 and 4.

The Office Action relies on Frazier for teaching a scaling factor. According to Frazier, an "image correction subsystem includes a test image generator that intermittently displays test images of a sufficiently short duration to be imperceptible to the viewer. For each test image, the image correction subsystem compares the input test image with the output color display image on a pixel-by-pixel basis, and generates correction factors . . .." Col. 3, lines 3-9. An "intensity correction scale factor is the ratio of nominal (test image input) intensity to actual (display image output) intensity for the pixel." Col.12, lines 29-31. When a frame is displayed, for each pixel, the "input intensity is multiplied by the intensity correction scale factor signal, and a corrected intensity signal is output from image correction subsystem 90."

Thus, Frazier determines a ratio between an input intensity of a test image and a displayed intensity of the test image, and then applies this ratio as a correction factor to the intensity of pixels of other frames being displayed on the display. Frazier's system corrects for the discrepancy between a desired intensity and an actual intensity provided by a display device. Notably, Frazier does not obtain the intensity values for this ratio from the pixel to which the ratio is applied. Thus, Frazier does not teach scaling the output saturation of a color corrected

pixel "according to a ratio of the input luminance [for the pixel] to the output luminance [determined for the pixel]".

Therefore, neither Yamakawa nor Frazier teaches "scaling the output saturation [for a pixel] by the scaling factor" where the scaling factor is determined "according to a ratio of the input luminance [for the pixel] to the output luminance [determined for the pixel]" as claimed in independent claims 1 and 4.

One of ordinary skill in the art would not have modified Yamakawa to apply a scaling factor to a pixel, where the scaling factor is a ratio between an input intensity of a test image and a displayed intensity of the test image as taught by Frazier. Yamakawa dynamically corrects gamma based on an average luminance – which has nothing to do with Frazier's adjustment of luminance based on the difference in intensity between a test image and its actually displayed result.

Moreover, such a combination would not result in the claimed invention because Frazier teaches using the ratio between an input intensity of a test image and a displayed intensity of the test image, and then applies this ratio as a correction factor to the intensity of pixels of other frames being displayed on the display – this ratio is not used in Frazier to correct the same pixel from which the intensity values are obtained.

Accordingly, the rejection of independent claims 1 and 4 is traversed. The remaining claims are dependent claims that are allowable for at least the same reasons.

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
NOV 0 5 2007

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, this application should now be in condition for allowance. A notice to this effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes, after this reply, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the Applicants' attorney at the telephone number listed below.

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicants hereby request any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee, please charge any fee to **Deposit Account No. 50-0876.**

Respectfully submitted,
Avid Technology, Inc.

By _____
Peter J. Gordon
Registration No. 35,164
Avid Technology, Inc.
One Park West
Tewksbury, MA 01876
Tel.: (978) 640-6789